



## Mapping the expanding and fracturing field of architecture

Golden, S. (2017). Mapping the expanding and fracturing field of architecture. In M. J. R. Couceiro da Costa, F. Roseta, S. Couceiro da Costa, & J. P. Lages (Eds.), *Architectural Research Addressing Societal Challenges* (Vol. 2, pp. 705-712). Taylor & Francis. <https://doi.org/10.1201/9781315116051>

[Link to publication record in Ulster University Research Portal](#)

**Published in:**  
Architectural Research Addressing Societal Challenges

**Publication Status:**  
Published (in print/issue): 16/02/2017

**DOI:**  
[10.1201/9781315116051](https://doi.org/10.1201/9781315116051)

**Document Version**  
Author Accepted version

**General rights**  
Copyright for the publications made accessible via Ulster University's Research Portal is retained by the author(s) and / or other copyright owners and it is a condition of accessing these publications that users recognise and abide by the legal requirements associated with these rights.

**Take down policy**  
The Research Portal is Ulster University's institutional repository that provides access to Ulster's research outputs. Every effort has been made to ensure that content in the Research Portal does not infringe any person's rights, or applicable UK laws. If you discover content in the Research Portal that you believe breaches copyright or violates any law, please contact [pure-support@ulster.ac.uk](mailto:pure-support@ulster.ac.uk).

# Mapping the expanding and fracturing field of architecture

S.M. Golden

*Ulster University, Belfast School of Architecture, Belfast, Northern Ireland*

This paper illustrates and discusses a unique mapping of architecture practice, tracing arrays of critical, compared to commercial, practice approaches. It visually interprets the sociologist and philosopher Bourdieu's theories on the interactions between agents and institutions to the field of architecture. Discussions relate Bourdieu's concepts of habitus and capital to key stages of UK architectural practice from the mid-1950s through 2015. The paper contributes to contemporary knowledge and debates about architects' shifting roles and practice types in privatised, market-led processes by providing a spatial framework to trace the increasingly fractured nature of the profession. Established and emerging areas of architecture, derived from literature reviews and primary sources, are evaluated as practice types in which agents seek — at one end of the field — to preserve, protect, or enhance traditional norms, versus those — at opposite ends — who challenge, and at times subvert traditional practice norms in favour of more critical approaches.

## 1 INTRODUCTION

Since the late twentieth century, architects increasingly work in larger-scale urban development frameworks, and in more diverse practice types where the private market has impacted the architecture field and the majority of individual architects' roles as creative professionals. This paper examines UK architecture practice-futures through related debates in academic and institutional settings, particularly those within the main UK architectural governing body, the Royal Institute of British Architects (RIBA). The paper sets out concepts underpinning original visual and text-based analysis, part of a larger body of research, which illustrates how architects face increasingly diverse roles as more (visually) prominent but less influential agents in privatised and global design and construction processes.

Beginning with a review of architectural, and sociological literature, the paper discusses practice structures and processes that combine creative and entrepreneurial skills with more explicit intellectual and value-laden action. Key theories about practice, and agent/field interactions are derived from the sociologist/philosopher Bourdieu's treatise of habitus, disposition, and motivation for individual agents in any given field.

Discussions frame conclusions about critical practice, spatial design, autonomy, and contingency in architecture, which are established, emerging, and

increasingly divisive topics between individual practitioners and the RIBA.

## 2 PRACTICE FUTURES IN THE 21<sup>ST</sup> CENTURY

Architecture remains one of the most publicly visible disciplines working to shape the built environment in the twenty-first century. Despite decreasing levels of influence on urban development decision-making, it is the discipline most often associated with building design and the production of urban space. In reality, most of the key decisions from strategic planning and land acquisition to setting out a particular project brief and its financial parameters are far removed from the influence of the architecture profession.

Debates about where knowledge and training should focus in the future include differences between core creative versus financial or technical skills (Building Futures, 2010a; RIBA, 2005), and between personal ethics compared with practice principles (Young, 2013). Prominent arguments often centre on how the professional field has and should continue to respond to the increasing dominance of private markets, which account for almost half of professional earnings (RIBA, 2013a).

The architecture profession is fragmented by internal debates about how to address the decline of roles valuing architects' creative design skills, and what might be the most appropriate future practice

priorities; further supporting commercial and market-led forces as exclusively building design agents or rethinking architects' role as more socially driven agents for the wider public. Oft-cited questions include whether architects can or should be socially responsible, and the extent to which they can influence change (Crawford, 1991).

Key debates about architects' skills examined here centre around calls for:

- Greater proficiency in commercial and economic skills - to support market-led development (Building Futures, 2010a);
- Calls for more autonomy as aesthetic experts and artists (Schumacher, 2010);
- Other voices, collectively known as transformative spatial agency, promoting alternative or more expansive forms of practice that might engage more with political and social contexts, rather than aligning to the control and values of the marketplace (Awan et al., 2011).

Contemporary arguments for greater architectural autonomy tend to focus on the status quo of architects as design experts with traditional building design/management skills enhanced by new technology (Schumacher, 2010). Technical, commercial, artistic, and activist views compete. Research promoting spatial agency includes international practices and project examples, evaluated for spatial judgement, mutual knowledge, and critical awareness skills that might challenge “strong normalising tendencies of mainstream architectural production” (Awan et al., 2011, pp. 26–27). There is no clear consensus about either the future centre of architectural culture or how to interrogate the status quo, and change it for the better (Awan et al., 2011).

Relative to UK professional context debates about existing and emerging practice types and skills training, the research here sought to first better define and visualise the centre and broader extent of architectural practice from the literature. The following section discusses how the RIBA and other influential bodies perceive the changing nature of the architectural profession to trace and discuss how UK practice has evolved since the post-war period.

## 2.1 The RIBA and practice future debates

Reports commissioned by the RIBA reflect widespread consensus at professional and academic levels that architecture has become less distinctive as both an occupation and a discipline (Building Futures, 2010b; RIBA Practice, 2000). The RIBA continually reviews the breadth of established and emerging practice types as part of its annual monitoring, and its established role to protect and promote the statutory title of architect in the UK.

The Institute's report, *The Future for Architects?*, conceded that practice contexts are “continuing to

change so dramatically that the skill sets required must also shift” (Building Futures, 2010b, p. 34). Practice types and work areas continue to be benchmarked in traditional building-related areas for housing, residential, education, mixed-use and offices; a single umbrella category covers all “other project types” (RIBA, 2013a). According to the *Future* report and further research, 93% of the Institute's *Chartered* architects (i.e., only those ARB licenced architects who register and pay annual fees to the RIBA) continue to earn their fees from “full services,” meaning from building design and construction contract management.

Additional RIBA research shows that there was a 40% reduction in demand for architects' services between 2007 and 2010, the first years of a global finance and property market recession (Building Futures, 2010a). From all full-service fees in a given year, almost half are reportedly earned by only 3% of Chartered practices (RIBA, 2013a). RIBA guidance suggests architects should adapt pro-actively to changing professional roles as an “opportunity to change attitudes toward development” and to demonstrate how good design is one of the values of the profession in “shaping better places and helping deliver a better quality of life” (RIBA, 2011, p. 01).

Practice types within the field, recognised by the RIBA, have expanded from a Post-WWII establishment view of “full service” designers and contract managers to a diverse, expanding, and contested roles including *local generalists*, *niche specialists* (including both design and technical specialisation), and *larger multi-disciplinary firms*. Additional practice types the RIBA has documented in annual monitoring surveys (Building Futures, 2010a) include:

- General design-led or more commercially-driven consultancy;
- Networked services, focusing on technical or design services;
- Globally networked practices, delivering all services on 24-hour timescales;
- Small metropolitan boutiques, offering “boundary pushing design...qualities of the star architect on a smaller scale”;
- Entrepreneurial BOOT (Build-Own-Operate-Transfer) design services; and
- Creative Agencies, practices “not committed to architectural services...more flexible in following the market.”

The definition and measure of practice sizes range from sole practitioners and micro practices of up to five members, to large offices with over fifty members (Building Futures, 2010a). Generally, larger commercial firms continue to dominate over smaller to medium design-led practices, while more traditionally architect-led roles in the design and construction industry are increasingly taken up by outside professions including planning, surveying and project management; bringing uncertainty about the

(or any) future meaning and role for architects (Building Futures, 2010b).

The following table (Table 1) illustrates increasingly fractured practice trends from the post-WWII period to the present, interpreted from the literature.

Table 1. Changing professional roles, 1955-2015 (Source: Author)

Key Date/ State of Practice	Established/ Traditional modes and roles	Emergent/ Challenging modes and roles
1955 Established	Public sector Full-service designer Masterplanner Corporate agent Planner	Academia/ Philosopher Urbanist Activist Facilitator
1975 Challenged	Corporate agent Artist-practitioner Community facilitator Activist Public sector Full-service designer Urbanist Philosopher Planner Academic	<i>Starchitect</i> Community facilitator Environmental activist Polemicist/ Theorist Design-led Design-build Multi-disciplinary generalist
1995 Fracturing	<i>Starchitect</i> Corporate agent Facilitator Academic Urbanist Multi-disciplinary Design-build Specialist designer Full-service designer Philosopher	Technician (computer) Parametricism Activist (critical practitioner) Design manager Facilities manager Master planner Practice-led research Design consultant
2015 Fractured	Corporate agent Niche-boutique/ Specialist Local generalist <i>Starchitect</i> Design consultant Design-build Multi-disciplinary B.O.O.T. CAD Technician Activist	Community enabler Network/ Collabora- tive practitioner Spatial agent Cooperative/ Entrepre- neurs Creative agents

With an increasing focus on systems-led forms of planning and private-led mechanisms for development in the 1960s – 1980s, architects influential roles as masterplanners working in the public sector decreased while more market-driven roles emerged. Changes in design team structures initiated by the UK Government during the 1990s led to declining roles for architects as team leaders and full-service designers on larger scale projects; roles increasingly challenged by professionals outside of architecture. In the early millennium, particularly the period following global financial crises and property value collapse after 2007, architects' esteem in roles as

starchitects and corporate agents became increasingly challenged from within the profession.

The most recent review of the architecture profession at a strategic/government level in the UK began in April 2013 when the Department for Culture Media and Sport (DCMS) appointed architect Sir Terry Farrell to work with the main professional architectural governing bodies, including the RIBA (DCMS, 2013; RIBA, 2013b). *The Farrell Review*, as it is commonly referred to, was completed in 2014 and represents the first important architect-led Government assessment of the profession and its role in shaping the UK built environment since Rogers' 1999 *Urban Task Force* report (The Urban Task Force, 1999). *The Farrell Review* acknowledged that “the nature, scale and scope of built environment design have changed beyond all recognition” (*The Farrell Review*, 2014, p. 08). It addressed the following themes: education, outreach, and skills; design quality; cultural heritage; economic benefits; and UK Government built environment policy. Some of the key focus areas included,

- How architecture could be “taught as a business and better connected to the marketplace, engineering and construction”;
- Globalisation;
- The role architecture's institutions should play in future practice;
- How to regain trust about design quality and “placemaking” issues in the built environment,
- Increasing architecture's influence at all development scales – “from local improvements to nationally significant projects.”;
- Encouraging “leading architects [...] to help the broader, more unsuccessful and unloved parts” of the built environment; and
- How to “prepare for the changing world order and rapid urbanisation across the globe in the twenty-first century”

The Review conclusions include recommendations for the profession to “reflect the major shift [in practice] toward two opposing tendencies – greater specialisation and diversified career paths on the one hand, and a greater need for integrating and joining things up on the other” (*The Farrell Review*, 2014, p. 67). The research presented in this paper addresses the above architecture specific challenges through a sociology-based approach, which is set out and discussed in the following section.

### 3 GAMES IN A FIELD: BOURDIEU'S SPATIAL THEORIES OF PRACTICE AND AGENCY

Bourdieu is regarded as one of the most prominent late twentieth century sociologists, contributing to education, culture, and art theory (Stevens, 1998). He established influential agent-field principles including key concepts about individual-collective

structures and interactions in a given field (e.g. education, art, politics), cultural-environmental influenced disposition, *habitus*, and taste/values, *distinction* (Bourdieu, 2010).

Bourdieu's treatise *Distinction* examines cultural preferences relative to social hierarchies, *capital*, across the French bourgeoisie, and has been adapted to qualitative/comparative studies in many fields including economics, art, and law (Grenfell, 2008). As architectural discourse has increasingly focused on aspects of agency and architects' interactions with each other and society – beyond a focus upon building outputs and design or theory for its own sake – Bourdieu's reflexive methods to document and evaluate what de Certeau called the genesis of practice – i.e., not what practices produce, but what produces them (de Certeau, 2011) – has become more prominent in architectural research.

Bourdieu's work has been characterised as drawing upon the language of architecture to convey both physical and non-physical spatial aspects of social interaction in everyday life (Dovey, 1996). Fourcade observed spatial references in Bourdieu's writings about financial markets; how, for Bourdieu, "markets are not structured by connections between buyers and sellers (over goods) but by homologies between the 'space of producers,' the 'space of consumers,' and the 'space of goods'" (Fourcade, 2007, p. 1022). The architect and urban theorist Dovey has noted in a related way that Bourdieu's concept of *habitus* "suggests that the built environment constructs the real as spatial ideology – a congruence between the "division" of space and our "vision" of the world (Dovey, 1999, p. 03).

Bourdieuian theory and methods – set out further in the next sub-section – were selected as particularly suited to this architectural practice-led research, to address how architects, as actors and agents, relate to institutional and social structures, and how culture and society interact (Webster, 2010). Bourdieu's subjectivist and grounded approach to agency-structure research (Stevens, 1998) also corresponds to the research (and researcher's) interpretivist aims and methodology.

### 3.1 *Field Theory: Individual dispositions and professional spheres*

Bourdieu describes fields as "a network, or a configuration, of objective relations between positions, objectively defined, in their existence and in the determinations they impose upon their occupants, agents or institutions" (Bourdieu in Wacquant, 1989, p. 39). He defines fields as bounded spheres and universes of activity and influence over certain people or objects. He identifies people and agents who enter a field as being "at once founded and legitimized [...] by their possessing a definite configuration of properties" (Bourdieu and Wacquant, 1992, p. 100), and,

[B]y their present and potential situation (*situs*) in the structure of the distribution of species of power (or capital) whose possession commands access to the specific profits that are at stake in the field, as well as by their objective relation to other positions (domination, subordination, homology, etc.) (Bourdieu in Wacquant, 1989, p. 39).

Bourdieu's research addresses individual agents' actions, and motivations to act in a particular field, which he describes as akin to "being in a game," knowing the "rules of the game," and having interest. His concept of interest in relation to action correlates to themes examined in this architectural research, including how architects' understandings of professional intention, motivation, and participation correspond to their approach/actions in practice. His metaphor for the norms of a field as a game allows rules to be challenged; thereby potentially affecting the game and those who might be dominant within a field in a given timeframe. Agents in a field, as players in a game, have choices to make relative to disciplinary doxa. Adapted to architecture in this research, it frames the findings about possibilities to challenge perceived material and symbolic norms.

At one end of a given field Bourdieu describes particular agents who "can play to increase or to conserve their capital," meaning they can remain "in conformity with the tacit rules of the game and the prerequisites of the reproduction of the game and its stakes" (Bourdieu and Wacquant, 1992, p. 99). Conversely, he describes how players with a different perspective can also aim to transform, partially or completely, the established rules of the game (Bourdieu and Wacquant, 1992). The latter type of players, what are referred to here as transformative agents, can apply "strategies aimed at discrediting the form of capital upon which the force of their opponents rests (e.g., economic capital) and to valorise the species of capital they preferentially possess" (Bourdieu and Wacquant, 1992, p. 99). In other words, agents including architects — as players — may be constrained and impacted upon by economic and political situations, but they are not trapped in a deterministic setting whereby their actions and position in the field are fixed, or on a stable trajectory.

The concept of play thereby introduces an agent's tacit skill and explicit choice to conform to or transform the tacit rules of the game;

Social agents are not 'particles' that are mechanically pushed and pulled about by external forces. [...] They have the propensity to orient themselves either toward the preservation of the distribution of capital or toward the subversion of this distribution (Bourdieu and Wacquant, 1992, p. 108).

The above themes are synthesised by Bourdieu's *practice-field (capital-habitus)* model (Bourdieu, 1986; Maton in Grenfell, 2008), which sets out a re-

relationship shown in Equation 1, whereby the totality of habitus, individually acquired “systems of disposition,” and capital, defined as “one’s position in a field,” is considered jointly “within the current state of play [doxa] of [a chosen] social arena (field)” (Bourdieu and Wacquant, 1992, p. 102). Capital can refer to an architect’s position in the professional field relative to economic, social, or cultural position among other factors.

$$[(\text{habitus}) \times (\text{capital}) + \text{field}] = \text{practice} \quad (1)$$

Bourdieu also set out three “necessary and internally connected moments” to study any given field (Bourdieu and Wacquant, 1992, p. 105):

- “First, analyze the field vis-à-vis the field of power.”
- “Second, map out the objective structure of the relations between the positions occupied by the agents or institutions who compete for the legitimate form of specific authority of [the] field”
- “Third, analyze the habitus of agents.”

He argues that fields can be examined to “assess how concretely they are constituted, where they stop, who gets in and who does not, and whether at all they form a field” (Bourdieu and Wacquant, 1992, p. 100). He further states that researching fields is an “endless to and from movement,” wherein “one must identify the forms of specific capital that operate [and] know the specific logic of the field” in order to “construct [its] forms of specific capital” (Bourdieu and Wacquant, 1992, p. 107).

Within the scope and constraints of this research and the contexts of contemporary UK architecture practice relative to the RIBA, the field of architecture is thus examined through a Bourdieuien lens. The outcomes and conclusions, which are both architecture specific and transferable to other professional fields are set out and discussed in the next section.

## 4 FINDINGS: MAPPING ARRAYS OF PRACTICE AND PRACTICE TYPES

Arrays of practice refer to unseen as well as more tangible aspects of architects’ career trajectories, choices, practice contexts, and other parameters that establish one’s professional identity as social, creative agents. The mapping structure and graphics presented herein (Figures 1- 4) are the author’s adaptation of Bourdieu’s well-known and widely published figures, used to display and discuss his research (Bourdieu, 2010, 1998).

Four original diagrams correlate individual architectural practice types and themes to different professional dispositions and relations between individual architects and the collective architectural field from the period following the Second World War in-

to the new millennium. Different sets of axes illustrate arrays of architecture practice, and critical, compared to commercial, practice approaches in a visual format. The visual format provides a spatial framework to understand how architects can adapt to more critical practice in privatised commercial contexts, and to evaluate the research as a unique contribution to debates on the changing architectural profession. The findings reflect the greater diversity of architecture practice, and the increasingly destabilised field, discussed in Section 2.1, and detailed in Table 1.

Figures 1 through 4 trace perceived changes in architecture from a more established (stable) field in the immediate post-WWII era to a fractured (dynamic, contested) field in the new millennium. Different practice types (architects practice roles) and themes (key theories or issues from the literature) are shown relative to the two sets of axes and the indicative centre of the field (representing normative building design-led roles). The locations of each practice type, and the centre of the field, shifting over time, are interpreted from the practice and theory literature. The following sub-sections set out and review each mapped stage in detail.

### 4.1 1955: Relative stability and widespread capital




Figure 1. The field of architecture, ca.1955 showing traditional norms (grey) & established practice roles with emergent types.

Figure 1 illustrates the field in a more stable and less complex state. The starting date is coincident with an important international milestone for architecture, planning, and what evolved into the separate/related discipline of urban design. As a base point for comparison, the 1955 map aims to capture the state of the UK field prior to the 1958 Conference on Architectural Education, a seminal event that brought in new systems of professional architectural training that remain more or less intact (Roaf and Bairstow, 2008).

The map indicates the traditional building design and contract management centre of the field as firmly established, with some areas or practice emerging



during the post-WWII period. Traditional agency is shown balanced on the social/cultural and economic centreline, encompassing “full services” by architects, as artistic and corporate architectural agents, including roles in key land acquisition and planning decisions as well as influence over the design, detail, and management of individual buildings. Urbanism is recognised and incorporated as an emerging, and already integral part of the centre of the field.

Two dotted-line shapes show important changes impacting the traditional centre. These changes include new processes and qualifications for professional academic training (left-hand), in which university based systems increased in intellectual and economic capital, replacing apprenticeships and tutelage as the primary route to professional qualifications. The post-WWII growth of corporate agency, larger international firms is shown as established, and impacting traditional roles for designers, planners, and the twentieth century version of ‘starchitects’ (important individuals including Mies Van der Rohe, Le Corbusier, Gropius, and others). The next mapping stage, 1975, continues to trace the field’s trajectory through a post-Keynesian era, when a resurgence of free-market ideology influenced architects to support increasingly dominant economic forces.

#### 4.2 1975: Challenging norms; resistance & retreat




Figure 2. The field of architecture, ca.1975 showing traditional norms (grey) & established practice roles with emergent types.

Figure 2 illustrates the field as corporate and free market influences became established across the traditional centre, shifting it in the direction of instrumental practices favouring economic capital over transformative and socially driven ideals. Postmodernism replaced modernism as the dominant theoretical and aesthetic practice by the early 1970s. Public sector roles for architects, and the number of architect-planners trained as spatial designers were both in decline, connected to changing policies for funding urban development and training/practice shifts in the 1960s from spatial to systems-led approaches

(Cuff, 2000). Within architecture therefore, the mapping indicates that planning is shifting out of traditional architectural roles, becoming less esteemed (i.e. lower status/capital) and associated with facilitator rather than designer roles.

The mapping reflects the growth of activism and critical theory in architecture, which developed from socio-political and economic periods of protest and civic unrest in the 1960s and early 1970s. The architecture profession was criticised as anachronistic, associated with the failures of large scale urban renewal projects and functionalist modernist housing estates (Papanek, 1985).

Shifts within the profession include an increasing status for both commercial roles and theory-driven academic areas, and emerging roles focused on community and the environment (Dutton and Mann, 1996). Dotted-line shapes here indicate increasing complexity of roles/types in the field, including the emergence of polemical theorist-practitioners and activists, and influences on the centre; denoted as the increasing capital of philosophical/autonomous modes of thought, as well as opposite trends toward economic/ instrumental practices, and the approaching era of deregulation.

#### 4.3 1995: Change and challenge; A fracturing field




Figure 3. The field of architecture, ca.1995 showing traditional norms (grey) & established practice roles with emergent types.

Figure 3 illustrates the impact of resurgent free market urban investment, and urban policy changes, established after 1979 by the Conservative Thatcher-led UK government. The archetypal standing of full-service architectural agency becomes less certain, reflected in the mapping text. Layers of dotted-line shapes show increasingly complex commercial, critical, and communicative aspect of professional practice. Transformative approaches and widening participation became established in professions like planning; emerging from allied social and planning theory into architecture in the mid to late 1990s

(Ghirardo, 1991; Gutman, 1988; Healey, 1993; Sorkin, 1991). The traditional centre is shown shifting further toward an economic, instrumental, and self-preservationist trajectory. The mapping thus reflects a fracturing of architectural practice types with new roles commonly aligning toward economic extremes, indicating practice efforts to survive and preserve the field.

During this period important strategic changes included new policies and investment mechanisms for urban development, which remains as larger-scale masterplanning and private-led models of regeneration in the twenty-first century. (Bell, 2005; Dietsch, 1995) Both the private sector and government bodies increasingly architects' status as design-team leaders, and as influential actors in decisions affecting the built environment. (Duffy, 1994) Government-commissioned reports including *Constructing the Team* (Latham, 1994) and *Rethinking Construction* (Egan and Construction Task Force, 1998) contributed to a restructuring of UK design and construction teams, a trend that continued into the millennium period, despite dramatic increases in property-led development.

#### 4.4 2015: Border crossings; a fractured field




Figure 4. The field of architecture, ca.2015 showing traditional norms (grey) & established practice roles with emergent types

Figure 4 illustrates architecture in the new millennium period of rapid urban development and increasing complexity within architecture practice, both of which define contemporary struggles between the social and economic space of the field. A substantial number of architects left the field or shifted their intended trajectory vis-à-vis the traditional centre during a sustained period of recession and uncertainty after 2007. The density of the mapping, and additional connecting shapes, reflect the fractured nature of practice. Emerging practice types appearing at the transformative/subversive extremes denote the expansion of practice roles beyond the recognised architectural field; a trend to normalise border crossings between architecture and other disciplines that

is resisted within the establishment, and the RIBA (Gunkel, 2001). There are increasing calls to remove or blur the boundaries of the field yet the commercial core remains the dominant power.

Two broken-line shapes show a growing divide between agents/practice types seen as preservationist and instrumental, and types seen as promoting opposite aims, to break open the field and its training processes toward more social/transformative ends. Established types of commercial practice at the *preservationist* end include management, design and build, specialist technical services, while more subversive types include enablers and insurgent architects, network/collaborative forms of practice, and new forms of critical spatial practice (Awan et al., 2011; Hou, 2010). Critical practice has shifted toward more active, real-world, and transformative approaches, in contrast to *autopoietic*, theory and computer-driven practices (Doucet and Cupers, 2009; Schumacher, 2010). While the traditional centre is shown intact as a space, it has shifted back toward the centre axis and is shown as increasingly congested by different competing practice themes and types, including design/artist-led, commercial, and new media-driven approaches; each vying for varying degrees of capital in the design and construction industry, and influence over the profession's future.

## 5 CONCLUSION

The mapping relates to the second of Bourdieu's connected moments, necessary to study a given field and the relations between "the positions occupied by the agents or institutions who compete for the legitimate form of specific authority of a field" (Bourdieu and Wacquant, 1992, p. 105). Thus, in the diagrams, a Corporate Agent is shown at opposite economic-socio/cultural scales to an Artist, yet both are shown with similar levels of established capital/status. Activists, an example of both an emerging and established type, are located at the socio/cultural end with increasing levels of status.

Contemporary practice challenges, reflected in the mapping, and in proposed new and redefined practice types "provide a glimpse of a world to come" where there are opportunities for change, and for interested architects to become agents of change (Hardt and Negri, 2012, p. 03). The examples and types, while indicative and subjective in one sense, represent real examples of practice choices available to architects. The findings demonstrate the extent to which other ways of practicing architecture exist, challenging limited skills training, and career guidance available to young practitioners, which overwhelmingly focuses on past norms where architects were full-service designers with high level of influence on development decision-making.



Finally, the research findings reveal a significant trend amongst architects to reframe their future practice and professional training as a means to proactively redress declining levels of influence; learning to adapt their training as designers and managers, to act transformatively, without ignoring or denigrating their innate and learned skills as creative professionals. These findings are supported by the extent to which once peripheral protagonists and practice roles are shown to challenge the status quo of commercial practice for esteem and professional capital.

## 6 ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The author acknowledges contributions to refine the research writing and diagrams from Dr T.M. Rikala, Prof I. Montgomery, and Prof C. Gormley-Heenan of the Ulster University Faculty of Art, Design & the Built Environment; and Faculty of Social Sciences.

## 7 REFERENCES

- Awan, N., Schneider, T., Till, J., 2011. *Spatial agency : other ways of doing architecture*. Routledge.
- Bell, D., 2005. The Emergence of Contemporary Masterplans: Property Markets and the Value of Urban Design. *Journal of Urban Design* 10, 81–110.
- Bourdieu, P., 2010. *Distinction: A Social Critique of the Judgement of Taste*, [1984] ed. Routledge.
- Bourdieu, P., 1998. *Practical Reason*, [1994] ed. Polity Press.
- Bourdieu, P., 1986. The production of belief: contribution to an economy of symbolic goods, in: Collins, R. (Ed.), *Media, Culture, and Society: A Critical Reader*. Sage Publications, pp. 131–163.
- Bourdieu, P., Wacquant, L.J.D., 1992. *An invitation to reflexive sociology*. University of Chicago Press.
- Building Futures, 2010a. *Practice Futures: Risk, Entrepreneurialism, Practice and the Professional Institute*. RIBA.
- Building Futures, 2010b. *The Future for Architects? Building Futures*, RIBA.
- Crawford, M., 1991. Can Architects be Socially Responsible?, in: Ghirardo, D. (Ed.), *Out of Site: A Social Criticism of Architecture*. Bay Press, Seattle, pp. 27–45.
- Cuff, D., 2000. Foreword, in: Kostof, S. (Ed.), *The Architect: Chapters in the History of the Profession*. University of California Press, pp. vii – xvi.
- DCMS, 2013. Sir Terry Farrell to lead independent review of architecture and the built environment [WWW Document]. URL <https://www.gov.uk/government/news/> (accessed 6.2.13).
- de Certeau, M., 2011. *The Practice of Everyday Life*, Third Edition [1984]. ed. University of California Press.
- Dietsch, D.K., 1995. Toward a New Urban Policy. *Architecture* 84, 15.
- Doucet, I., Cupers, K., 2009. Agency in Architecture: Rethinking Criticality in Theory and Practice. *Footprint: Reframing Criticality in Theory and Practice* 1–6.
- Dovey, K., 1999. *Framing places : mediating power in built form*. Routledge.
- Dovey, K., 1996. Social Theory & Space Syntax: Exploring Power and Spatial Programming, in: IAPS 14 Conference Proceedings. Presented at the Evolving Environmental Ideals - Changing Way of Life, Values and Design Practices, pp. 149–158.
- Duffy, F., 1994. Architecture: Vision and talent in a waste of tat - Francis Duffy, president of the Royal Institute of British Architects, rejects a BBC documentary's apocalyptic view of our landscape. *The Independent*.
- Dutton, T.A., Mann, L.H. (Eds.), 1996. *Reconstructing Architecture: Critical Discourses and Social Practices*. University of Minnesota Press, Minneapolis.
- Egan, J., Construction Task Force, 1998. *Rethinking Construction: The Report of the Construction Task Force*. Crown Ltd.
- Fourcade, M., 2007. Theories of Markets and Theories of Society. *American Behavioral Scientist* 50, 1015–1034.
- Ghirardo, D., 1991. *Out of Site: A Social Criticism of Architecture*. Bay Press, Seattle.
- Grenfell, M., 2008. Pierre Bourdieu : key concepts. *Acumen*.
- Gunkel, D.J., 2001. What's the matter with architecture?, in: Hill, J. (Ed.), *Architecture - the Subject Is Matter*. Routledge, pp. 73–88.
- Gutman, R., 1988. *Architectural Practice: A Critical View*. Princeton Architectural Press.
- Hardt, M., Negri, A., 2012. *Declaration*. Argo-Navis.
- Healey, P., 1993. Planning Through Debate: The Communicative Turn in Planning Theory, in: Fischer, F., Forester, J. (Eds.), *The Argumentative Turn in Policy Analysis and Planning*. Taylor & Francis, pp. 233–253.
- Hou, J., 2010. *Insurgent public space*. Routledge.
- Latham, M., 1994. *Constructing the team: final report: joint review of procurement and contractual arrangements in the United Kingdom construction industry*. HMSO.
- Papanek, V., 1985. *Design for the Real World: Human Ecology and Social Change*, 2nd ed. Thames & Hudson.
- RIBA, 2013a. *RIBA Business Benchmarking: 2012/13 Executive Summary*. RIBA.
- RIBA, 2013b. RIBA welcomes Sir Terry Farrell's Review of Architecture and the Built Environment [WWW Document]. URL <http://www.architecture.com/NewsAndPress/> (accessed 6.2.13).
- RIBA, 2011. *Guide to Localism-Part2:Getting Community Engagement Right, Guide to Localism*. RIBA.
- RIBA, 2005. *Constructive Change: A Strategic Industry Study into the Future of the Architects' Profession*. RIBA.
- RIBA Practice, 2000. *Architects and the Changing Construction Industry*. RIBA.
- Roaf, S., Bairstow, A., 2008. *The Oxford Conference: A Re-Evaluation of Education in Architecture*. WIT Press.
- Schumacher, P., 2010. *The Autopoiesis of Architecture: A New Framework for Architecture*. John Wiley & Sons.
- Sorkin, M., 1991. *Exquisite Corpse: Writing on Buildings*. Verso.
- Stevens, G., 1998. *The Favored Circle: The Social Foundations of Architectural Distinction*. MIT Press.
- The Farrell Review of Architecture + the Built Environment: *Our Future in Place*, 2014. . DCMS.
- The Urban Task Force, 1999. *Towards an Urban Renaissance: Final Report of the Urban Task Force Chaired by Lord Rogers of Riverside*. DETR, London.
- Wacquant, L.J.D., 1989. Towards a Reflexive Sociology: A Workshop with Pierre Bourdieu. *Sociological Theory* 7, 26–63.
- Webster, H., 2010. *Bourdieu for Architects*. Routledge.
- Young, E., 2013. Collective Conscience. *RIBA Journal* 120, 68–70.